



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,836	08/07/2001	William F. Scholz	46991/GTL/A23	5259

24574 7590 07/23/2003

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO, LLP  
1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS, 7TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER
----------

AHMAD, NASSER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------


1772

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS 12

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/925,836</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Scholz et al.</b>	
	Examiner <b>Nasser Ahmad</b>	Art Unit <b>1772</b>	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Nasser Ahmad (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Grant Langton (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jul 22, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 43 and 46.

Identification of prior art discussed:  
Samonides and McNaul


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant argued that the prior art fails to teach a continuous method of making the claimed product and that the adhesive is laminated with a film layer prior to its fully cured state. Examiner informed the applicant that it is unclear as to where the boundary is between the uncured and fully cured state of the adhesive when the adhesive is a pressure sensitive adhesive. As explained further, the applied reference also has adhesive that exhibits tackiness prior to laminating it with a film forming material, similar to what is being claimed. Also, the process steps disclosed in both the references are directed to a continuous method.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

  
**NASSER AHMAD**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 1772**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required